1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7

INTRODUCTION.

THE reader of the following pages, having already seen what has induced me to come forward with an historical account of the Indians, after so many have written on the same subject, will perhaps look for something more extraordinary in this, than in other works of the kind which he has seen. Not wishing any one to raise his expectations too high, I shall briefly state, that I have not written to excite astonishment, but for the information of those who are desirous of knowing the true history of those people, who, for centuries, have been in full possession of the country we now inhabit; but who have since emigrated to a great distance. I can only assure them, that I have not taken the information here communicated from the writings of others, but from the mouths of the very people I am going to speak of, and from my own observation of what I have witnessed while living among them. I have, however, occasionally quoted other authors, and in some instances copied short passages from their works, especially where I have thought it necessary to illustrate or corroborate my own statements of facts.

In what I have written concerning the character, customs, manners, and usages of these people, I cannot have been deceived, since it is the result of personal knowledge, of what I myself have seen, heard, and witnessed, while residing among and near them, for more than thirty years. I have however to remark, that this history, like other histories of former times, will not in every respect comport with the character of the Indians at the present time, since all these nations and tribes,

1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7

177 by their intercourse with the white people, have lost much of the honourable and virtuous qualities which they once possessed, and added to their vices and immorality. Of this, no one can be a better judge than a missionary residing among them. And if, what these people told us more than half a century ago; that lying, stealing, and other vicious acts, before the white men came among them, were considered as crimes, we may safely conclude —and we know it to be fact—that from that time to this, and especially within the last forty years, they have so much degenerated, that a delineation of their present character would bear no resemblance to what it was before.—It is therefore the history of early times, not of the present, that I have written; and to those times my delineations of their character must be considered to apply; yet, to shew the contrast, I have also delineated some of their present features.

128 [101] It may be proper to mention in this place, that I have made use of the proper national name of the people whom we call *Delawares*, which is: "*Leuni Lenape.*" Yet, as they, in the common way of speaking, merely pronounce the word "*Lenape*," I have, in most instances, when speaking of them, used this word singly. I have also made use of the word "*Mengwe*," or *Mingoes*, the name by which the *Lenape* commonly designate the people known to us by the name of the *Iroquois*, and *Five* or *Six Nations*. I shall give at the end a general list of all the names I have made use of in this communication, to which I refer the reader for instruction.

[195] As the Indians, in all their public speeches and addresses, speak in the singular number, I have sometimes been led to follow their example, when reporting what they have said; I have also frequently, by attending particularly to the identical words spoken by them, copied their peculiar phrases, when I might have given their meaning in other words.

On the origin of the Indians, I have been silent, leav-

9 [Erratum. See cat. 116, p. 348. - Analyst]

1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7
Iroquois NM9

D
128

ing this speculation to abler historians than myself. To their history, and notions with regard to their creation, I have given a place; and have also briefly related the traditions of the Lenape on the subject of their arrival at, and crossing the river Mississippi, their coming to the Atlantic coast, what occurred to them while in this country, and their retreat back again.

As the relation of the Delawares and Mohicans, concerning the policy adopted and pursued by the Six Nations towards them, may perhaps appear strange to many, and it may excite some astonishment, that a matter of such importance was not earlier set forth in the same light, I shall here, by way of introduction, and for the better understanding of the account which they give of this matter, examine into some facts, partly known to us already, and partly now told us in their relation; so that we may see how far these agree together, and know what we may rely upon.

D
I
174

It is conceded on all sides that the Lenape and Iroquois carried on long and bloody wars with each other; but while the one party assert, that they completely conquered the other, and reduced them by force to the condition of women, this assertion is as strongly and pointedly denied by the other side; I have therefore thought that the real truth of this fact was well deserving of investigation.

The story told by the Mingoes to the white people, of their having conquered the Lenape and made women of them, was much too implicitly believed; for the whites always acted towards the Delawares under the impression that it was true, refused even to hear their own account of the matter, and "shut their ears" against them, when they attempted to inform them of the real fact. This denial of common justice, is one of the principal complaints of the Lenape against the English, and makes a part of the tradition or history which they preserve for posterity.

1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7

hospitality. I have witnessed their virtues and experienced their goodness. I owe them a debt of gratitude, which I cannot acquit better than by presenting to the world this plain unadorned picture, which I have drawn in the spirit of candour and truth. Alas! in a few years, perhaps, they will have entirely disappeared from the face of the earth, and all that will be remembered of them will be that they existed and were numbered among the barbarous tribes that once inhabited this vast Continent. At least, let it not be said, that among the whole race of white Christian men, not one single individual could be found, who, rising above the cloud of prejudice with which the pride of civilisation has surrounded the original inhabitants of this land, would undertake the task of doing justice to their many excellent qualities, and raise a small frail monument to their memory.

I shall conclude with a few necessary remarks for the information of the reader.

Lenni Lenape being the national and proper name of the people we call "Delawares," I have retained this name, or for brevity's sake, called them simply *Lenape*, as they do themselves in most instances. Their name signifies "*original people*," a race of human beings who are the same that they were in the beginning, *unchanged* and *unmixed*.

These people (the Lenni Lenape) are known and called by all the western, northern, and some of the southern nations, by the name of *Wapanachki*, which the Europeans have corrupted into *Apenaki*, *Openagi*, *Abenaquis*,* and *Abenakis*.† All these names, however differently written, and improperly understood by authors, point to one and the same people, the Lenape, who are by this compound word, called, "people at the rising of

* Colden. † La Hontan.

l:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7

the Sun," or, as we would say, *Eastlanders;* and are acknowledged by near forty Indian tribes, whom we call nations, as being their grandfathers. All these nations, derived from the same stock, recognise each other as Wapanachki, which among them is a generic name.

The name "*Delawares,*" which we give to these people, is unknown in their language, and I well remember the time when they thought the whites had given it to them in derision; but they were reconciled to it, on being told that it was the name of a great white chief, Lord de la War, which had been given to them and their river. As they are fond of being named after distinguished men, they were rather pleased, considering it as a compliment.

The *Mahicanni* have been called by so many different names,* that I was at a loss which to adopt, so that the reader might know what people were meant. Loskiel calls them "Mohicans," which is nearest to their real name Mahicanni, which, of course, I have adopted.

The name "*Nanticokes*" I have left as generally used, though properly it should be *Nentico*, or after the English pronunciation *Nantico.*

The "*Canai,*" I call by their *proper* name. I allude here to those people we call *Canais, Conois, Conoys, Canaways, Kanhawas, Canawese.*

With regard to the Five, or Six Nations, I have called them by different names, such as are most common, and well understood. The Lenape (Delawares) are never heard to say "*Six Nations,*" and it is a rare thing to hear these people named by them otherwise than *Mengwe;* the Mahicanni call them *Maqua,* and even most white people call them *Mingoes.* When I therefore have said the *Five* or *Six Nations,* I have only used our own

* The Dutch called them Mahikanders; the French, Mourigans, and Mahingans; the English, Mohiccons, Mohuccans, Mohegans, Muhheekanew, Schatikooks, River Indians.

1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca.1800) 1819
NM7 Delaware NM7

mode of speaking, not that of the Indians, who never look upon them as having been so many *nations*; but *divisions* and *tribes*, who, as united, have become a nation. Thus, when the Lenape (Delawares) happen to name them as one body, the word they make use of implies "the five divisions together, or united," as will be seen in another place of this work. I call them also *Iroquois*, after the French and some English writers. 128

The *Wyandots*, or *Wyondots*, are the same whom the French call *Hurons*, and sometimes *Guyandots*. Father Sagard, a French Missionary, who lived among them in the 17th century, and has written an account of his mission, and a kind of dictionary of their language, says their proper name is *Ahouandáte*, from whence it is evident that the English appellation Wyandots has been derived.

There being so many words in the language of the Lenape and their kindred tribes, the sound of which cannot well be represented according to the English pronunciation, I have in general adopted for them the German mode of spelling. The *ch*, particularly before a consonant, is a strong gutturaf, and unless an Englishman has the use of the Greek χ, he will not be able to pronounce it, as in the words *Chasquem* (Indian corn,) *Cheltol* (many,) *Ches* (a skin,) *Chauchschisis* (an old woman,) and a great many more. Sometimes, indeed, in the middle of a word substitutes may be found which may do, as in the word *Nimachtak* (brethren,) which might be written, *Nemaughtok*, but this will seldom answer. This is probably the reason that most of the English authors have written Indian words so incorrectly, far more so than French authors. 104 194 [192] [114]

The Delawares have neither of the letters R, F, nor V, in their language, though they easily learn to pronounce them. They have a consonant peculiar to them and other Indians, which is a sibilant, and which we

2:Newcomb E-4,5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

II. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF DELAWARE CULTURE

Introduction

The most recent reconstruction of early historic Delaware culture by Herman[1] failed to use the data made available by Kinietz[2] from the Trowbridge and Cass papers and minimized contemporary ethnographic data. Herman largely ignored modern ethnographic information because it "had combined material gained from different periods of time."[3] Kinietz used the previously unavailable Trowbridge and Cass data, but took little advantage of the other sources. His work also omitted a discussion of religion and some aspects of social organization. This study has utilized most of the source material of both of these investigators, as well as their results, and has in addition used other documentary materials. I have also used modern ethnographic data more extensively than have others. By using proper controls the ethnography of the Delawares can be made to cast valuable light on some of the less well-illuminated aspects of the early historic culture. The presence of a culture trait, whose existence could not be traced to white culture, to other Indian cultures, or to some sort of synthesis of these, was assumed to be of Delaware origin. It should be noted that some traits found in the field were considered Delaware on the basis of their absence among other groups; documentary materials later confirmed a Delaware provenance for many of these traits. Evidence from the field indicated, for example, that the Delawares possessed the trait of making a hole at the head of a coffin through which the soul could find its exit. Exit and reentrance were eased by the application of red ocher to this aperture. No evidence could be found which would indicate that this trait had been borrowed from other Indian cultures, nor was it derived from white culture, except that wooden coffins were used in place of bark receptacles. Later research substantiated the conclusion that this trait was of Delaware origin. In brief, by using a cautious and judicious approach it is possible to project ethnographic data back to early historic times with a fair degree of probability. Wherever this approach has been utilized, it is so noted in the text. I have also made a more serious effort to reconstruct the kinship terminology and general kinship structure of the early historic Delawares than has been attempted previously. This reconstruction is based mainly upon the recent suggestions of Murdock.[4]

The authorities for the data are given in chronological order, the seventeenth-century sources are given first, then the eighteenth-century, and so on down to the data recorded by myself in the field. When data secured from informants is used, the initials of the informant appear in the text or in a footnote with other references.[5] A discussion of the documentary sources is given in the Appendix.

[1] Herman, 1950, pp. 45-77.
[2] Kinietz, 1948.
[3] Herman, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
[4] Murdock, 1949, pp. 184-250, 323-53.
[5] Initials of informants are: O. A., Ollie Beaver Anderson; M. B., Mary Bob; N. D., Lenora Dean; J. T., Jim Thompson; F. W., Fred Washington; R. W., Reuben Wilson; L. F., Lillian Frenchman.

2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

journeys in which corn was crushed into a meal, "or roasted in hot ashes, then crushed." To this maple sugar was added. This mixture could be stirred in water and boiled or could be eaten dry without cooking.[85] Adams, a Delaware and historian of his people, added that "they carried very simple food," parched corn pounded into a brown meal, sweetened with maple sugar, and mixed together with bear's lard.[86]

Water was the principal drink although various fruits and nuts were sometimes added. They "prepared a kind of liquor like milk by gathering a great number of hickory and black walnuts, dried and crushed them. Then they took out the kernels, pounded them as fine as flour, and mixed this with water so that it looked like milk and was almost as sweet."[87] Both Kinietz' and my informants (O.A., M.B.) held that their ancestors had regular meal times. Penn said that "they eat twice a day, Morning and Evening."[88] Men and women apparently ate together but children ate separately (O.A.). All of my informants stressed the fact that in the past an individual could eat anywhere in the village, and that everybody shared what food was available.

Food taboos. — It is unlikely that there were any general, culture-wide food taboos in early historic times. Certain foods may have been denied to an individual by his guardian spirit, but this is merely a supposition. Not even the animals symbolic of the phratries were taboo. Heckewelder, however, noted a taboo on the rabbit, identified with a culture-hero. He said that the Delawares, among other tribes, avoided the horse, dog, wildcat, ground hog, panther, fox, muskrat, and wolf;[89] De Laet, however, quoting Henry Hudson, described a "fat dog" which was butchered for a feast.[90] Rather than emphasize the few things that were not eaten by the Delawares, it would be more in keeping with the facts to state that the Delawares made relatively complete use of the edibles available to them, except rabbit and ground hog. Their tastes were catholic and were only slightly blunted by socioreligious proscriptions.

Delaware Economics

Although the methods by which and the persons by whom the need-serving goods were processed, distributed, and consumed are properly an aspect of social organization, it probably contributes more to an understanding of Delaware technology to discuss them under the heading of economics.

Division of Labor

The division of labor among the Delawares, as is true of cultures with analogous means of production, was predominantly sexual in

[85] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 22.
[86] Adams, 1905, p. 8.
[87] Kalm, 1937, I: 269.
[88] Penn, 1912, p. 233; Luckenbach, 1938, p. 599, agreed on this point.
[89] Heckewelder, 1881, pp. 251-52, 196; Zeisberger, 1910, pp. 132, 140.
[90] De Laet, 1909, p. 49.

2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

not uncommon: "Mr. Conner knows of many instances of it having been committed, sometimes by shooting, but generally by eating the root of the may apple. It proceeds most frequently from excess of gref (sic) or from disappointment in love."[117] There are indications, then, of a pattern of sex-oriented suicide in Delaware culture at least as early as the eighteenth century.

Kin Groups

There is no way of knowing exactly how much Delaware kinship structure and terminology changed in the two and a half centuries following European invasion. That it did change during this period is virtually certain, since factors which induce change were present, such as altered rules of residence, decreased polygyny, and increased economic and political importance of men. The literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries gives no description of the kinship structure. L. H. Morgan was the first investigator to furnish information on the subject, obtaining his data in 1859 on the Kansas reservation of the Delawares. Even at this time Morgan termed the system "deteriorated."[118] I shall first describe the system found by Morgan, then compare it with the modern one, and finally turn to a reconstruction of the early historic system. Kinship terms given by Zeisberger and other earlier authors are too scant to yield any information; these nuclear terms agree with Morgan's lists.

Nineteenth-Century Kinship Terms and Principles

The kinship system of both the Munsi and Unami has been called the "Mackenzie Basin" type by Spier, and would be termed Hawaiian by Murdock.[119] According to Morgan, the essential features of the Delaware (Unami) system (Fig. 1, p. 45: Fig. 2, p. 46) were:

1. A brother's son and daughter, whether Ego was male or female, were termed son and daughter.
2. A sister's son and daughter, Ego a male, were nephew and niece. Ego a female, they were son and daughter.
3. Parallel and cross-cousins were termed stepbrother and stepsister, "the males and females using different terms."[120]
4. A father's brother was termed little father.
5. A mother's brother was termed uncle.
6. Mother's sister, father's sister, and father's brother's wife were termed little mother.
7. All grandparents and all kin of the second ascending generation were called grandmother or grandfather.

[117] Trowbridge MS.
[118] Morgan, 1871, p. 221.
[119] Spier, 1925, p. 76; Murdock, 1949, pp. 223, 228.
[120] Morgan, 1871, pp. 221-22.

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

the effort to do them good, and he gives dispassionately and honestly what he had abundant opportunity to learn of their character, customs and country.

The name of this volume, "History of the Indians," was not given to the manuscript by its author, but, by the Bishop De Schweinitz. Zeisberger, had he named it, would probably have called it, "Notes on the History, Life, Manners, and Customs of the Indians," and the most casual reader will recognize from the mode of presentation and the occasional repetitions that the manuscript is in the form of notes. It has seemed best, however, to reproduce it verbatim as written. The complete analytical index will fully make up for irregularity in arrangement and the lack of proper ordering of the material.

This manuscript, of upwards of eighty thousand words, was evidently written for the Rev. Henry Loskiel to aid him in the preparation of his most valuable *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians of North America*. Deriving his material from various sources, and writing inclusively of all the American Indians, Loskiel made less use of Zeisberger's manuscript than one would suppose, possibly incorporating, in one form or another, one-third of this manuscript and giving very slight recognition of the source of information. Moreover, writing as one who had little first-hand knowledge of his subject, many facts told by the venerable missionary of a certain Indian tribe lost, under Loskiel's treatment, much of their value, especially, when represented as though true of the typical American Indian. The result is that these pages from Zeisberger's pen, in the opinion of the editors, give the most reliable and accurate description in existence of the Indians of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, written by one intimately acquainted with them. Lacking the polish and general literary excellence of his comrade John Heckewelder's *History*, the student perusing the two will surely agree that for solid information given in simple straight-forward style, the Zeisberger notes take first rank as a work of value. For instance, Zeisberger was practically uninfluenced by the appalling superstitions of the savages; the shams and frauds of their impotent sorcerers made but little impression on the rugged sense of the faithful missionary; so much so that one cannot

judged by the results of treatment rather than by the science of composition. I might compare it, in some respects, to the tenets of Christian Science without, I hope, doing too much injustice to the basis of this much favored school of reasoning. The Delaware would offer an instance of the powerful influence of religious beliefs upon professional technique, cited by Kirkpatrick (1929, p. 249) and elaborated by Boas (1929), Goldenweiser (1922) and Lowie (1924b) among American students of the subject. Here, however, lies an extended field for investigation which in no manner depends for its development upon Delaware data but in which, I hope, this material will find a place as illustrative of the status of magical science and religion among one of the eastern Algonkian tribes.

That the Delaware of today are not so different from their forebears of two centuries ago as regards ability to treat cases that baffle their rivals of the European profession, is shown by a statement in 1698 of Gabriel Thomas (1912, pp. 323, 340) who said, "The Indians are able doctors and surgeons as any in Europe, performing celebrated cures therewith." From the account written by Heckewelder (1876, p. 229) we have the following testimony. "I, myself, have been benefited and cured by taking their emetics and medicines in fevers, and by being sweated after their manner while laboring under a stubborn rheumatism. I have also known many, both whites and Indians, who have with the same success resorted to the Indian physicians, while laboring under diseases .. . I firmly believe that there is no wound, unless it should be absolutely mortal, or beyond the skill of our own good practitioners, which an Indian surgeon (I mean the best of them) will not succeed in healing." Zeisberger also refers to their ability to treat successfully different maladies, especially diseases peculiar to women. As for the present my informant lays claim to the curing of thirty-two persons during his sojourn in Philadelphia, for which he received no more regular compensation than voluntary gifts from persons of the underprivileged classes.

In assembling the botanic material presented here, specimens of plants were gathered in the wider Philadelphia area in company with my informant who explained at length their medicinal properties and uses. This collection was later supplemented by a few plants sent me by Wi·tapanóxwe from his home in Oklahoma. From time to time such specimens were submitted to Dr. John M. Fogg, Department of Botany, University of Pennsylvania, who very kindly checked their scientific identity. At the conclusion of the investigation a complete list of plant specimens was sent to M. R. Gilmore, University of Michigan, for comment of an ethno-botanical nature.

In the text, bibliographic citations are indicated by the author's name and the date of publication, to permit ready reference to the bibliography.

[p. xii is blank]

131
177 Delaware tribe was gathered together on a reservation in Kansas in 1835 and from there removed to their present location in Oklahoma, where they are politically incorporated in the Cherokee nation. Other Delaware, most of whom belonged to the Munsee division and were converted by Moravian missionaries in the eighteenth century, are now located in Ontario.

DELAWARE CULTURE

128 The method of presentation which has been followed is to place the authorities for each statement immediately after it. For the most part, traits for which there is no evidence in earlier sources have been omitted, but where this leaves a large gap in the picture of the culture, sections based purely on eighteenth century sources have been inserted. The material has been divided into three main aspects, and proceeds from a consideration of economic life, to social organization and religion.

Means of Procuring Food

226 For the tribes living on the east coast, fishing was probably the most important means of getting food, judging from the relative amounts of shells and animal bones found in ancient sites (Skinner, [262] 1915, p. 7). Oysters, clams, mussels and scallops were widely utilized as well as rockfish, shad, herring, sturgeon and gar fish which were found plentifully in those waters (Abbott, 1875, p. 278; Skinner, 1909, p. 46).

According to Lindstrom, the Indians caught fish by building a dam across a stream near its source or at a waterfall. When the river rose, the last small opening was closed in the dam and the water allowed to flow over it, leaving the fish in shallow water at low tide. They were then either taken by hand or shot with bow and arrow (sic). The latter method was also used in deep water (Lindstrom, 1915, pp. 219-220). Other writers report the use of hemp nets, and [227] a number of stone sinkers have been found in archaeological sites. Rude seines of matted leaves and twigs are mentioned as well as fishing spears (Abbott, 1875, pp. 278 and 361; Heye, p. 70; Skinner, 1915, pp. 7 and 10; Harrington, 1913, p. 222).

224 The Delaware's hunting was done both cooperatively and individually. Early Swedish writers have described one cooperative method in which deer were surrounded either by a ring of men or by a ring of fire, and driven toward the center where they were shot with bow and arrow. Sometimes they were driven into a river where they were lassoed (Johnson, p. 281; Lindstrom, p. 214). According to a later writer, these hunting parties had a leader and were governed by definite rules, but there is no direct evidence for this in pre-contact times (Loskiel, p. 77). These organized hunt took place in the fall, but hunting itself was a year round occupation

6:Harrington E-5 (1907-1910)1921
NM7 Delaware NM7
Lenape

PREFACE

THE following paper is intended to be the first of a series concerning different phases of the culture of the Lenape or Delaware Indians, once a numerous people forming a confederacy of three closely related tribes, the Unami, the Minsi or Muncey, and the Unala'tko or Unalachtigo, first encountered by the whites in what is now New Jersey, Delaware, eastern Pennsylvania, and southeastern New York, but at last accounts[1] reduced to some 1900 souls scattered in Oklahoma and the Province of Ontario, Canada, with a few in Wisconsin and Kansas. Of these the Lenape of Oklahoma seem to be mainly of Unami extraction, the rest largely Minsi, while the Unala'tko appear to have merged with the others and to have lost their identity.

128 ●
101

[161]

[p. 12 is blank]

6:Harrington E-5 (1907-1910) 1921
NM7 Delaware NM7
Lenape

104

e like a in fate.
ĕ as in met.
i as in machine.
ĭ as in hit.
o as in note.
u as in flute.
ŭ as in but.
ů as in full.
ʷ faintly whispered.
ʟ a surd l.
x like German ch.
Other consonants approximately as in English.

128

It was intended at first to publish the mass of material thus obtained in the form of a monograph on the ethnology of the Lenape; but later it was seen that while some phases of their culture could be described in considerable detail, there were others not so well represented in our notes. It was therefore finally decided to publish at once such parts as were ready, in the form of separate papers, and to leave the others until more detailed information could be obtained.

No extended comparisons of the religion and ceremonies of the Lenape with those of other tribes will be attempted in this paper, these being reserved for a projected article to embody the results of a comparative study of Lenape culture.

M. R. HARRINGTON

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

114 128 These three relations on the Delaware, hereafter denoted by the names John Johnston, Captain Pipe and Captain Chipps, were analyzed according to the questions they answered and transcribed into an element list in terms of the information they contained. The list was designed so that the information of each account could be tabulated and the presence or absence of a trait be indicated by a symbol such as a plus or a minus in columns headed by the name of the source.

This table was then expanded to include information derived from five sources which preceded these three in point of time. In the first three columns the information from Roger Williams, Adriaen Van der Donck, and Peter Lindeström appears, in that order.[a] Only the last one of these accounts definitely relates to the Delaware. The other two are given as early accounts of tribes neighbor to the Delaware which may reflect the contemporary conditions among them as well, particularly the account of Van der Donck who included the Delaware River within the boundaries of New Netherlands. Williams' account was published in 1643, Van der Donck's was republished in 1656, and probably written about 1653, and Lindeström's account was written by him from notes made from 1654 to 1656.

In the fourth and fifth columns the information of Zeisberger and Heckewelder as contained in their published accounts is presented.[b]

---

[a] Williams, Roger, "A Key into the Language of America . . . Together with Brief Observations of the Customes, Manners, and Worships, &c. of the Aforesaid Natives, in Peace and Warre, in Life and Death . . . ," in Rhode Island Historical Society, *Collections*, 1(1827), 17-163; Van der Donck, Adriaen, "A Description of the New Netherlands . . . ," in New York Historical Society, *Collections*, 2 series, 1(1841), 129-242; Johnson, Amandus (ed. and trans.), *Geographia Americae with an Account of the Delaware Indians Based on Surveys and Notes Made in 1654-1656 by Peter Lindeström* . . . (The Swedish Colonial Society, Philadelphia, 1925).

[b] Hulbert, Archer B., and Schwarze, William N. (eds.), "David Zeisberger's History of the Northern American Indians," in *Ohio Archæological and Historical Publications*, XIX(1910), 1-189; Heckewelder, John, *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighbouring States* . . . (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, *Memoirs*, XII, Philadelphia, 1876).

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

After these historical accounts information on the same points obtained from four informants among the Oklahoma Delaware was recorded. It had been the original plan to conclude the tabulation of accounts of different periods with a survey of present customs among the Delaware. In the field work, however, it soon became apparent that such a survey would be meaningless if it did not include work with practically every person with Delaware blood. Furthermore, it was difficult for the informants to give coherent accounts of both past and present customs. In the end, the relations of several older people were taken for past customs and four of them constitute the accounts of the last period in the tabulation. Even though they never participated in some of the elements covered, their relations undoubtedly are representative of the period when there was a more unified and distinct Delaware culture; whereas, no handful of informants could possibly be responsible for all the aspects of the diversified practices and beliefs of the present. There was no selection of informants' accounts and rejection of others except on the basis of completeness.

This table is given on pages 22 to 37.

The exact phrasing of the Cass questions could not be used in working with the informants, as they were designed to be answered by persons familiar with the Indians rather than by the Indians themselves. The four informants whose accounts were used were:

J. W.: Joe Washington, Wann, Okla. Age 65. Wolf Clan.

W. T.: Willie Thomas, Anadarko, Okla., Age 65. Turtle Clan.

E. R.: Eli H. Reynolds, Anadarko, Oklahoma. Age 43. Only his mother was Delaware. She was Turkey and Wolf.

W. L.: Willie Longbone, Dewey, Okla. Age 70. Turtle Clan.

The information derived from these twelve accounts, beginning with that of Roger Williams, was analyzed in the sequence in which the various elements are entered in the table. Following the table there is a discussion of those elements showing any change over the entire period covered by the various accounts. Finally, there is a section of ethnographic notes on some of the elements.

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

114 The twelve accounts may be divided into two groups on the
126 basis of their origin. The first eight were obtained from written
128 sources, five published and three unpublished. The last four were obtained from field work among the modern Delaware. For convenience, the first group will hereafter be called sources and the last group informants. Considering the time of inscribing or of obtaining the information on which they are based, the eight sources are found to form three groups and to represent three periods: the first composed of the accounts of Williams, Van der Donck, and Lindeström, dated 1643, 1653, 1656, respectively; the second, of the accounts of Zeisberger, 1780, and Heckewelder, whose account, although not published until 1819, is considered contemporaneous, as he left active mission work in 1786; and the third group, of the three Cass manuscripts dated 1823 and 1824. The accounts of the modern informants constitute the fourth group and period.

In the discussion of the different elements, comparison is usually between the accounts as grouped in these four periods. As page references to citations from the accounts of the three manuscripts and the four informants are impossible, they have been omitted for the published accounts also, in the interests of uniformity. When neither the tabulation of the material from the different accounts nor the section of ethnographic notes amplifying or qualifying the tabulated element list indicates the existence of any problem on any element, that element is omitted in the discussion. Numbers in parentheses refer to the numbers given to the elements on the table.

DISCUSSION OF THE ELEMENTS

Astronomy, Mathematics, etc.

§21 The Delaware of the present indicate a knowledge of astronomy and mathematics that was not reported in historical accounts (3, 13). Whereas lack of knowledge or understanding on the part of some of the early reporters may be responsible for
[177] some of the apparent change, it is more reasonable to assign the cause of several of these changes to white contact. Belief in the

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

The only other apparent change in the tabulation of the accounts of the different periods is the possession of the drum (466). Roger Williams stated that the Indians had no drums but that he had known one to make a good drum in imitation of the English. This may have been true, but it is most improbable that the spread of the drum over the entire continent can be attributed to its introduction by Europeans, especially in view of its known prehistoric use by certain tribes of Indians. The aboriginal possession of the flute is more questionable than that of the drum (470). This wind instrument was not reported before the third period.

Summary

Before summarizing the analysis of the culture chronology of the Delaware it may be well to state that no one is more keenly aware than I am of the unsatisfactory nature of some of the source material. This material must be utilized, however, in a study of cultural change extending over the number of years that this one does. I have endeavored to avoid the many pitfalls engendered by the use of this material. Items that had to be watched particularly were the subjective nature of some of the elements and the diverse use of terms by different authors. Four hundred and thirty-eight elements were considered cultural and comparable. This total eliminates elements on which there is information from only one period, elements on constitution, and elements giving ages within limits.

One of the first things to be observed in a perusal of the tabulation of accounts is the relatively small number of elements on which there is a complete disagreement between sources and informants. There are only twenty-three cases out of 438 elements in which the statements of one of the informants is not in agreement with at least one of the sources. Fifteen of the twenty-three elements represent changes. The remaining eight cases, or approximately two per cent of the total, are the only elements on which the informants' accounts as a whole deviate from those of the sources. This correspondence validates the use of data remembered by informants even though they may have

9: Kinietz E-4,5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

121 learned of the discontinued customs through the relations of their
128 ancestors rather than through actual participation.

[114] Another noteworthy aspect is the frequency of contradictions in each period. Doubtless fuller information for each period would result in more conflicting reports. As it is, the list of contradictions is headed by eleven elements which show nothing but contradiction in every period. These eleven elements at least indicate that there was no one practice for these cases and illustrates the fallacy of relying on a single source or supposing the existence of a single practice.

121 Two hundred and forty-one elements were reported upon by
128 sources and informants without any disagreement. To get an
177 understanding of the stability of the culture, to these 241 elements should be added the eleven elements just mentioned, for they all show continuity, making a total of 252, or 57.3 per cent, of the 438 elements analyzed. All of these do not carry through from the first period to the last, for of the 438 elements, answers were returned on 210 in the first period, on 276 in the second, on 416 in the third, and on 436 in the fourth. Some of these elements appearing only in the later periods may represent additions to the culture, as in the case of the blowgun, but, in view of the lack of information on the earlier periods, they cannot be so considered.

177 There are 65 changes very definitely indicated. The changes are divided among the technological, sociological, and spiritual aspects of the culture thus: 16, 38, and 11, respectively. For the 77 technological, 262 sociological, and the 99 spiritual aspects so classified, these represent percentages of 20.77, 14.5, and 11.11, respectively. The series are too small for these small differences to be of great significance. Nevertheless, these figures are the nearest thing to proof that we have for the hypothesis that it is the spiritual life of a people in contact with a superior culture that is the least susceptible to change, that sociological concepts and practices are next, and that technological concepts and practices are the most susceptible.

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

WELDER and JOHN JOHNSTON said that the proportion was rather more than among the whites, the former attributing the cause to the introduction of liquor.

W. T. denied that there were any sterile Indian women. W. L. said that he knew of two cases.

169. Number of Children

ZEISBERGER gave the usual number of children as 4 to 6 in one place, whereas in another he said 8 to 12.

HECKEWELDER said that generally there were 4 to 5 children in a family, while some families had 6 to 9, and a few had as many as thirteen.

173 and 174. Age of marriage

VAN DER DONCK said that both men and women commonly got married only when they were fit to do so.

DEATH AND ITS INCIDENTS

The following accounts touch on so many points not treated by the others or each other that they are given here in their entirety.

CAPTAIN PIPE—As soon as life leaves the body some distant relative of the deceased takes upon himself the charge of paying the last offices. Two men and two women, not related, are employed in washing and dressing the body, (now in a white cloth; anciently in a newly dressed skin,) which is laid upon a kind of platform where it is kept one day previous to the interment. This time was formerly three days in summer and seven days in winter, because they supposed that the tutelar deity of the deceased might restore them to life; but at this day they seem to have little faith and are apparently anxious to get the corpse out of sight as soon as decency will permit. The two male attendants prepare a coffin in which they place the body, and it is borne by them to the grave, preceded by the relatives and succeeded by the more distant friends. The grave is dug about three feet deep and the coffin is covered with earth as among the whites. Before they knew the use of boards the grave was lined with bark and the body pro-

10: Speck E-4, 5 (ca. 1925) 1931
NM7 Delaware NM7

cover Delaware phrases. In the section giving the Delaware text have been included footnotes explaining and analyzing terms which seem to require elucidation, or which through their idiomatic meanings seem to call for special notation in the eyes of the linguistic student. 121

In the free translation I have attempted to preserve the order, emphasis, terms of thought and wording characteristic of native speech. It is obvious, however, that the translator can not adhere faithfully in his rendering to native traits of syntax and thought composition in all cases; the result would be in English quite unintelligible.[1] Even to attempt this as much as I have, may seem to some readers, not familiar with thought-processes in other than Indo-European tongues, to create confusion in idea, or at least to present some peculiarly twisted expressions. I may remark, however, that both points of view have been given careful and prolonged consideration before the translations have been released. 128

The text, as the informant dictated it, in the course of the four months during which we were engaged, seemed to unfold almost in the character of a canon. He showed a very thoughtful manner in arranging its parts and the wording, conveying the impression that certain sections or chapters had a formal sequence, that certain topics belonged inseparably with it, and that other matters which came in for discussion as we proceeded did not belong to it.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE BIG HOUSE CEREMONY.—The ceremony which is the object of our study has borne several proper names in historical literature. The formal designation seems to have been Gamwing, a designation for the ceremony used by several of the earlier writers, and still recognized by the Delawares as being a proper term. Yet no explanation of its meaning, to be relied upon, is forthcoming from any of our sources.[2] Of equal prominence is the designation Xinwika'on, "Big House," which in the tongue of the Delawares is a favorite term of reference to both the edifice, or temple, in which the ceremony is performed, and the ceremony itself. This designation predominates in our text. The Delawares are not 796 552

[1] Compare Zeisberger's remarks on the language (op. cit., p. 143). "They are able to express themselves with great clearness and precision, and so concisely that much circumlocution is required to convey the full meaning of their expressions in an European language."

That the language in the middle of the 17th century, even when only approximately recorded, is still intelligible to the Delawares, appears from the following. In David de Vries Notes (1632) (Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey, and Delaware, 1630-1707, Ed. by Albert Cook Myers (1912), p. 16), it is recorded on the 8th of December, that while moored in the lower Delaware River, the Indians declared they would "make a firm peace which they call *raconiya marcuit*." This is the equivalent of ma'wanilolangu'ndi·n, "all agree to make peace."

[2] The term was no more capable of explanation in Zeisberger's day (1780), it would seem, than it is among the Delawares of today. He says, "This feast is called 'ngammuin, the meaning of which they themselves are unable to give. (op. cit., p. 138).

10: Speck E-4, 5 (ca. 1925) 1931
NM7 Delaware NM7

We may dismiss for the present, the problem of their origin after giving the opinion of our informant, with which Harrington coincides, that they were local groups, district populations in an older habitat, which had accumulated the characteristic of sib groupings with maternal descent and exogany. Heckewelder,[1] over a century ago, who knew the Delawares so well, had sound reasons for his opinion on the character of the triple "totemic" groupings as being geographical divisions, originally tribal subdivisions. These, he continues to say in his discussion, again developed local sub-groupings that took name from localities, the eighteen so-called "clans" of Morgan and Harrington. The Delaware designation for these groups is wihil·a'i·n, "name or title."

EXPLANATION OF CHARACTERS USED IN THE TEXT

In general conformity with the suggestions of the committee on the transcription of Indian languages, I have employed the following characters in the transcription of the text. Occasional variation in the spelling of native terms will be found in the narrative, due to variability of pronunciation by the informant. This it has been thought wiser to retain until a more detailed study of sounds and phonetic laws can be made.

The Oklahoma dialect does not abound in the voiceless final vowels and syllables which, according to Sapir,[2] characterize the dialect spoken by the Delawares of the Grand River reserve in Ontario.

There is no indication whatever in Delaware of an *r*, or *th* (*θ*) recorded by Brinton for instance, (in Lenape Dictionary), as in Munsee and Mahikan, and by Campanius (1645-96).[3]

p, *b* bilabials, occasionally intermediate when preceding the dark vowels, *a*, *o*, *u*.

p' a true, slightly aspirated, surd

m bilabial similar to English *m*.

t surd, as *t* in English ten.

d intermediate alveolar sonant between surd and sonant quality.

t' a pure slightly aspirated surd.

s surd, sibilant, corresponding to English *s* when followed or preceded by *i*, otherwise with slightly deflected tongue tip bringing it closer to *θ*, *(th)* with which it corresponds in Munsee.

n alveolar, not differing from English *n*.

ŋ post-palatal, corresponding to English *ng* in king.

k somewhat intermediate surd stop, medial palatal similar to English *k* in lock. Often not distinguishable from *g*.

---

[1] Heckewelder, op. cit., pp. 51-53, 250.

[2] E. Sapir, Geol. Survey of Canada, Summary Report, 1912, p. 6.

[3] The supposed change from *r* to *l* in later Delaware is discussed by Heckewelder, Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc. IV, 1834, pp. 351-96.

14: Stewart E-5 (1936-1938)1944 NR13 Northern Paiute
Delaware NM7
Winnebago NP12
Comanche NO6

C
D
W
171
127
128
795

APPENDIX II. PEYOTE ELEMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

The distribution list in this section was first devised upon the basis of experience with Ute peyotism and a study of published literature on the peyote cult generally.* The published accounts of the cult, however, did not contain the detailed information necessary to answer all the points raised, and so a blank copy of the list and a request to fill it out were sent to several ethnographers known to have attended peyote meetings. The response was most gratifying, time and knowledge being given freely. The locations of the tribes represented in the element list are indicated on map 2.

SYMBOLS USED IN THE ELEMENT LIST

+	Element present	( )	Exactness of data doubtful
—	Element absent	R	Recent development
Blank	Information lacking	*	Indicates that a note to the element is appended at the end of the list

SOURCES AND COLUMN ABBREVIATIONS

The sources for the data in both the list and the notes to the list, and the abbreviations at the heads of columns, are as follows:

13 T: Composite picture of cult of thirteen tribes visited by La Barre and Schultes, mostly in Oklahoma (Kickapoo, Kiowa, Quapaw, Shawnee, Wichita, Caddo, Comanche, Delaware, Osage, Oto, Pawnee, Ponca, Southern Cheyenne). Richard Evans Schultes, Peyote and Plants used in the Peyote Ceremony, HU-BML 4:127–152, 1937, with additions made on list by La Barre, 1938.

K-A: Kiowa-Apache. List filled in and notes supplied by J. Gilbert McAllister from information obtained during ethnographic field work performed 1933–1934 (eleven months) under the sponsorship of the University of Chicago.

Kio: Kiowa. List filled in and notes supplied by Weston La Barre. When returning the list La Barre wrote, "I believe that in peyotism tribal affiliation in this inter-tribal religion is far less important than leadership, i.e., what the particular leader's 'way' is, and from what leader he got his meeting." La Barre did field work in Oklahoma under the auspices of the Laboratory of Anthropology (1935), Yale University, and the American Museum of Natural History.

C
127
128
795

Com: Comanche in Oklahoma. List filled in and notes supplied by E. Adamson Hoebel.

Kic: Kickapoo in the vicinity of McLoud, Oklahoma. List filled in and notes supplied by John A. Noon, who attended a meeting during the summer of 1932. The Kickapoo leaders recognized that they "followed the Kiowa-Comanche 'way'."

Ab S: Absentee Shawnee of central Oklahoma. List filled in and notes supplied by Erminie W. Voegelin. Meeting attended in 1933. Voegelin reports three forms of the cult among the Absentee: (1) The Kiowa-Comanche form (the form which my list records); said to have been introduced about 1900 from the Kickapoo, who learned it from the Comanche; is the most popular form. (2) Caddo-Delaware variant of the "Wilson way," conducted by Ernest Spybuck. (3) Yuchi "way," conducted by Panther; considered by Voegelin's informants to be distinct from the Kiowa-Comanche version, yet probably only slightly variant. Membership in these forms of the cult does not interfere with participation in older Shawnee religious beliefs and ceremonies. The "Cherokee" or "Loyal" Shawnee in northeastern Oklahoma, however, take peyote "according to the Bible way . . . like those Ioways," which is La Barre's Oto "Christianized" version, and this does teach complete withdrawal from older native ceremonies.

D
127
128
795

De 1: Kiowa-Comanche type cult among the Delaware. List filled in by James C. Webber (a Delaware informant recommended by Dr. Frank Speck) and supplemented by Petrullo's published account, also principally from Webber.

De 2: "Wilson way" among the Delaware (La Barre's Caddo-Delaware). Abstracted from Petrullo's book, with additional notes supplied by James C. Webber. The list does not adequately bring out the degree of divergence which the cult has attained, which could only be done by devising a list based on the "Wilson way." The altar is greatly changed from the Kiowa-Comanche prototype and at times becomes extremely elaborate (see Petrullo, pls. 3–6).

W
127
128
795

Win: Winnebago of Nebraska. This is apparently a variant of the "Wilson way," although Alexis A. Praus, who filled in the list and supplied the notes, did not designate it as such. Praus attended

* Data for the Ute and Washo–Northern Paiute lists obtained in the field, and additional data on the cults of the Tarahumara, Tepehuan, Lipan Apache, Mescalero Apache, Kiowa, Oto, Delaware, Omaha, Iowa, Arapaho, Winnebago, and Taos from published literature, are part of my Ute Peyotism which has been accepted for publication by Anthropos.